

On f -Symmetries of the Independence Polynomial

Vadim E. Levit

Department of Computer Science and Mathematics

Ariel University, Israel

levitv@ariel.ac.il

Eugen Mandrescu

Department of Computer Science

Holon Institute of Technology, Israel

eugen_m@hit.ac.il

Abstract

An *independent* set in a graph is a set of pairwise non-adjacent vertices, and $\alpha(G)$ is the size of a maximum independent set in the graph G .

If s_k is the number of independent sets of cardinality k in G , then

$$I(G; x) = s_0 + s_1x + s_2x^2 + \dots + s_\alpha x^\alpha, \alpha = \alpha(G),$$

is called the *independence polynomial* of G (I. Gutman and F. Harary, 1983).

If $s_{\alpha-i} = f(i) \cdot s_i$ holds for every $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, \lfloor \alpha/2 \rfloor\}$, then $I(G; x)$ is called *f -symmetric* (*f -palindromic*). If $f(i) = 1, i \in \{0, 1, \dots, \lfloor \alpha/2 \rfloor\}$, then $I(G; x)$ is called *symmetric* (*palindromic*).

The *corona* of the graphs G and H is the graph $G \circ H$ obtained by joining each vertex of G to all the vertices of a copy of H .

In this paper we show that if H is a graph with p vertices, q edges, and $\alpha(H) = 2$, then $I(G \circ H; x)$ is f -symmetric, where

$$f(i) = \left(\frac{p(p-1)}{2} - q \right)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}-i}, 0 \leq i \leq \alpha = \alpha(G \circ H).$$

In particular, if $H = K_r - e, r \geq 2$, we show that $I(G \circ H; x)$ is symmetric and unimodal, with a unique mode. This finding generalizes results due to Stevanović [22] and Mandrescu [21] claiming that $I(G \circ (K_2 - e); x) = I(G \circ 2K_1; x)$ is symmetric and unimodal for every graph G .

Keywords: independent set, independence polynomial, symmetric polynomial, palindromic polynomial.

MSC 2010 classification: 05C69, 05C76, 05C31.

1 Introduction

Throughout this paper G is a simple graph with vertex set $V(G)$ and edge set $E(G)$. If $X \subset V(G)$, then $G[X]$ is the subgraph of G spanned by X .

By $G - W$ we mean the subgraph $G[V - W]$, if $W \subset V(G)$. We also denote by $G - F$ the subgraph of G obtained by deleting the edges of F , for $F \subset E(G)$, and we write shortly $G - e$, whenever $F = \{e\}$.

The *neighborhood* of a vertex $v \in V$ is the set

$$N_G(v) = \{w : w \in V \text{ and } vw \in E\}, \text{ and} \\ N_G[v] = N_G(v) \cup \{v\}.$$

If there is no ambiguity on G , we use $N(v)$ and $N[v]$, respectively.

K_n, P_n, C_n denote respectively, the complete graph on $n \geq 1$ vertices, the chordless path on $n \geq 1$ vertices, and the chordless cycle on $n \geq 3$ vertices.

The *disjoint union* of the graphs G_1, G_2 is the graph $G = G_1 \cup G_2$ having as vertex set the disjoint union of $V(G_1), V(G_2)$, and as edge set the disjoint union of $E(G_1), E(G_2)$. In particular, nG denotes the disjoint union of $n > 1$ copies of the graph G . The *Zykov sum* of the disjoint graphs G_1, G_2 is the graph $G_1 + G_2$ with $V(G_1) \cup V(G_2)$ as a vertex set and

$$E(G_1) \cup E(G_2) \cup \{v_1v_2 : v_1 \in V(G_1), v_2 \in V(G_2)\}$$

as an edge set.

The *corona* of the graphs G and H is the graph $G \circ H$ obtained from G and $|V(G)|$ copies of H , such that each vertex of G is joined to all vertices of a copy of H .

An *independent* set in G is a set of pairwise non-adjacent vertices. An independent set of maximum size is a *maximum independent set* of G , and the *independence number* $\alpha(G)$ is the cardinality of a maximum independent set in G .

Let s_k be the number of independent sets of size k in a graph G . The polynomial

$$I(G; x) = s_0 + s_1x + s_2x^2 + \dots + s_\alpha x^\alpha, \quad \alpha = \alpha(G),$$

is called the *independence polynomial* of G [7]. For a survey on independence polynomials of graphs see [15]. Some basic procedures to compute the independence polynomial of a graph are recalled in the following.

Theorem 1.1 [7] (i) $I(G_1 \cup G_2; x) = I(G_1; x) \cdot I(G_2; x);$

(ii) $I(G_1 + G_2; x) = I(G_1; x) + I(G_2; x) - 1;$

(iii) $I(G; x) = I(G - v; x) + x \cdot I(G - N[v]; x)$ holds for every $v \in V(G)$.

A finite sequence of real numbers $(a_0, a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n)$ is said to be:

- *unimodal* if there exists an index $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$, called the *mode* of the sequence, such that

$$a_0 \leq \dots \leq a_{k-1} \leq a_k \geq a_{k+1} \geq \dots \geq a_n;$$

- *f-symmetric (f-palindromic)* if $a_{n-i} = f(i) \cdot a_i$ for all $i \in \{0, \dots, \lfloor n/2 \rfloor\}$;
- *symmetric (palindromic)* if $a_i = a_{n-i}, i = 0, 1, \dots, \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$, i.e., $f(i) = 1$ for all $i \in \{0, \dots, \lfloor n/2 \rfloor\}$.

A polynomial is called *unimodal* (*symmetric*, *f-symmetric*) if the sequence of its coefficients is unimodal (symmetric, *f*-symmetric, respectively). For instance, the independence polynomial:

- $I(K_{127} + 3K_7; x) = 1 + \mathbf{148}x + 147x^2 + \mathbf{343}x^3$ is non-unimodal;
- $I(K_{43} + 3K_7; x) = 1 + 64x + 147x^2 + \mathbf{343}x^3$ is unimodal and non-symmetric;
- $I(K_{18} + 3K_3 + 4K_1; x) = 1 + 31x + \mathbf{33}x^2 + 31x^3 + x^4$ is symmetric and unimodal;
- $I(K_{52} + 3K_4 + 4K_1; x) = 1 + 68x + \mathbf{54}x^2 + 68x^3 + x^4$ is symmetric and non-unimodal;
- $I(P_3 \circ (K_2 \cup K_1); x) = 1 + 12x + 52x^2 + 105x^3 + 104x^4 + 48x^5 + 8x^6$ is *f*-symmetric for $f(i) = 2^{3-i}, 0 \leq i \leq 3$.

For other examples, see [12, 13, 14, 16, 23, 24]. Alavi, Malde, Schwenk and Erdős proved that for every permutation π of $\{1, 2, \dots, \alpha\}$ there is a graph G with $\alpha(G) = \alpha$ such that $s_{\pi(1)} < s_{\pi(2)} < \dots < s_{\pi(\alpha)}$ [1].

Theorem 1.2 [9] $I(G \circ H; x) = (I(H; x))^n \bullet I\left(G; \frac{x}{I(H; x)}\right)$, where $n = |V(G)|$.

The symmetry of matching polynomial and characteristic polynomial of a graph were examined in [11], while for independence polynomial we quote [10, 22, 18, 19]. It is known that the product of two unimodal polynomials is not necessarily unimodal.

Theorem 1.3 [2] *If P and Q are both unimodal and symmetric, then $P \cdot Q$ is unimodal and symmetric.*

However, the above result can not be generalized to the case when P is unimodal and symmetric, while Q is unimodal and non-symmetric; e.g.,

$$P = 1 + x + 3x^2 + x^3 + x^4, Q = 1 + x + x^2 + x^3 + 2x^4, \text{ while} \\ P \cdot Q = 1 + 2x + 5x^2 + 6x^3 + 8x^4 + 7x^5 + 8x^6 + 3x^7 + 2x^8.$$

It is worth mentioning that one can produce graphs with symmetric independence polynomials in different ways (see, for instance, [3, 8, 22]).

In this paper we prove that if H is a graph with p vertices, q edges, and $\alpha(H) = 2$, then $I(G \circ H; x)$ is *f*-symmetric, where $f(i) = \left(\frac{p(p-1)}{2} - q\right)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}-i}$, $0 \leq i \leq \alpha = \alpha(G \circ H)$. In particular, if $H = K_r - e$, where $r \geq 2$ and e is an edge of K_r , then $I(G \circ H; x)$ is symmetric and unimodal with a unique mode. As a consequence, we deduce that $I(G \circ (K_2 - e); x) = I(G \circ 2K_1; x)$ is both symmetric [22] and unimodal [21] for every graph G .

2 Results

The polynomial $P(x)$ is symmetric if and only if it equals its reciprocal, i.e.,

$$P(x) = x^{\deg(P)} \cdot P\left(\frac{1}{x}\right).$$

We generalize this observation using $\frac{1}{cx}$ instead of $\frac{1}{x}$.

Lemma 2.1 *If $P(x) = \sum_{i=0}^n a_i x^i$ is a polynomial of degree n , then*

$$P(x) = c^{\frac{n}{2}} \cdot x^n \cdot P\left(\frac{1}{c \cdot x}\right) \text{ if and only if } a_{n-i} = c^{\frac{n}{2}-i} \cdot a_i, 0 \leq i \leq n.$$

Proof. Since

$$c^{\frac{n}{2}} \cdot x^n \cdot P\left(\frac{1}{cx}\right) = c^{\frac{n}{2}} \cdot x^n \cdot \sum_{i=0}^n \frac{a_i}{(cx)^i} = \sum_{i=0}^n c^{\frac{n}{2}-i} \cdot a_i \cdot x^{n-i} = \sum_{i=0}^n c^{i-\frac{n}{2}} \cdot a_{n-i} \cdot x^i,$$

we infer that

$$P(x) = c^{\frac{n}{2}} \cdot x^n \cdot P\left(\frac{1}{cx}\right) \Leftrightarrow a_i = c^{i-\frac{n}{2}} \cdot a_{n-i} \Leftrightarrow a_{n-i} = c^{\frac{n}{2}-i} \cdot a_i, 0 \leq i \leq n,$$

and this completes the proof. ■

If $\frac{a(x)}{b(x)} = \frac{a(f(x))}{b(f(x))}$, then $f(x)$ is an *invariant* of the rational function $\frac{a(x)}{b(x)}$. Actually, from the point of view of Gutman's formula from Theorem 1.2, we are mostly interested in finding invariants for rational functions of the form $\frac{x}{b(x)}$.

Lemma 2.2 *The rational function $\frac{x}{b_0 + b_1 x + b_2 x^2}$ admits only two invariants, namely, $f_1(x) = x$ and $f_2(x) = \frac{b_0}{b_2 x}$.*

Proof. Since

$$\frac{x}{b_0 + b_1 x + b_2 x^2} = \frac{f(x)}{b_0 + b_1 f(x) + b_2 f(x)^2} \Leftrightarrow b_2 x f(x)^2 - (b_0 + b_2 x^2) f(x) + b_0 x = 0,$$

we get the following solutions: $f_1(x) = x$ and $f_2(x) = \frac{b_0}{b_2 x}$. ■

Theorem 2.3 *Let G be a graph of order n , and H be a graph of order p and size q , with $\alpha(H) = 2$. Then the polynomial $I(G \circ H; x)$ is:*

- (i) *f -symmetric, where $f(i) = \left(\frac{p(p-1)}{2} - q\right)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}-i}$, $0 \leq i \leq \alpha = \alpha(G \circ H)$;*
- (ii) *symmetric if and only if $H = K_r - e$ for some $r \geq 2$.*

Proof. (i) Since $\alpha(H) = 2$, one can write $I(H; x) = 1 + px + mx^2$, where $m = \frac{p(p-1)}{2} - q$. By Lemma 2.2, the function $g(x) = (mx)^{-1}$ is the only non-trivial invariant of $\frac{x}{I(H; x)}$. Thus we get

$$I(H; g(x)) = 1 + p \cdot g(x) + m \cdot (g(x))^2 = (mx^2)^{-1} \cdot I(H; x).$$

According to Lemma 2.2, it follows

$$\begin{aligned} I(G \circ H; g(x)) &= (I(H; g(x)))^n \cdot I\left(G; \frac{g(x)}{I(H; g(x))}\right) = \\ &= (mx^2)^{-n} \cdot (I(H; x))^n \cdot I\left(G; \frac{x}{I(H; x)}\right) = (mx^2)^{-n} \cdot I(G \circ H; x). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, we have $I(G \circ H; x) = m^n \cdot x^{2n} \cdot I(G \circ H; \frac{1}{mx})$. Since every $v \in V(G)$ is joined in $G \circ H$ to a copy of H , it follows that each independent set S of $G \circ H$ containing a pair of non-adjacent vertices from every copy of H is a maximum independent in $G \circ H$, i.e., $\alpha(G \circ H) = 2n$. Lemma 2.1 implies that $I(G \circ H; x)$ is f -symmetric, where

$$f(i) = \left(\frac{p(p-1)}{2} - q\right)^{n-i}, 0 \leq i \leq 2n = \deg(I(G \circ H; x)).$$

(ii) The polynomial $I(G \circ H; x)$ is symmetric if and only if $f(i) = 1$, $0 \leq i \leq \alpha$. By part (i), it means $\frac{p(p-1)}{2} - q = 1$, and this holds if and only if $H = K_p - e$, where e is some edge of K_p . ■

It is worth noticing that $K_2 - e = 2K_1$, and this leads to the following.

Corollary 2.4 [22] *The polynomial $I(G \circ 2K_1; x)$ is symmetric for every graph G .*

Recall that a graph G is *perfect* if $\chi(H) = \omega(H)$ for every induced subgraph H of G , where $\chi(H)$ denotes the chromatic number of H [4].

Proposition 2.5 [17] *If G is a perfect graph with $\alpha(G) = \alpha$ and $\omega = \omega(G)$, then*

$$s_{\lceil(\omega\alpha-1)/(\omega+1)\rceil} \geq \dots \geq s_{\alpha-1} \geq s_{\alpha}.$$

The Strong Perfect Graph Theorem, due to Chudnovsky *et al.*, [5], [6], asserts that a graph G is perfect if and only if it contains no odd hole (i.e., C_{2n+1} , $n \geq 2$) and no odd antihole (i.e., $\overline{C_{2n+1}}$, $n \geq 2$) as an induced subgraph.

Proposition 2.6 *If G is a perfect graph of order n , then the coefficients (s_i) of the polynomial $I(G \circ (K_p \cup K_q); x)$ satisfy the following:*

$$s_{\lceil(2n\omega-1)/(\omega+1)\rceil} \geq \dots \geq s_{2n-1} \geq s_{2n} \text{ and } s_0 \leq \dots \leq s_{t-1} \leq s_t,$$

$$\text{where } t = 2n - \lceil(2n\omega - 1) / (\omega + 1)\rceil \text{ } \omega = \max\{\omega(G), p, q\}.$$

Proof. It is easy to see that

$$\alpha(G \circ (K_p \cup K_q)) = 2n, \quad \omega = \omega(G \circ (K_p \cup K_q)) = \max\{\omega(G), p, q\}.$$

Since $G \circ (K_p \cup K_q)$ has no odd hole and no odd antihole as an induced subgraph, Strong Perfect Graph Theorem assures that $G \circ (K_p \cup K_q)$ is perfect. According to Proposition 2.5, it follows that

$$s_{\lceil (2n\omega-1)/(\omega+1) \rceil} \geq \dots \geq s_{2n-1} \geq s_{2n}.$$

By Theorem 2.3, we have that

$$s_{2n-i} = (pq)^{n-i} \cdot s_i, 0 \leq i \leq n.$$

Since $s_{2n-i} \geq s_{2n-i+1}$, for $2n-i \geq \lceil (2n\omega-1)/(\omega+1) \rceil$, we obtain

$$(pq)^{n-i} \cdot s_i \geq (pq)^{n-i+1} \cdot s_{i-1} \iff s_i \geq pq \cdot s_{i-1} \implies s_{i-1} \leq s_i,$$

for $1 \leq i \leq 2n - \lceil (2n\omega-1)/(\omega+1) \rceil$, as claimed. ■

It is easy to see that the sum of two symmetric and unimodal polynomials is not necessarily symmetric and/or unimodal.

Lemma 2.7 *Let $p(x)$ and $q(x)$ be polynomials of degree r and $r-1$ respectively, for some $r \geq 2$, and let $p(0) \neq 0$ and $q(0) = 0$. If $p(x)$ and $q(x)$ are symmetric and unimodal, then so is $p(x) + q(x)$. Moreover, if the mode of $p(x)$ or $q(x)$ is unique, then the mode of $p(x) + q(x)$ is unique as well.*

Proof. The symmetry and unimodality of $p(x) + q(x)$ were proved in [3].

Assume that the mode of $p(x) = a_0 + \dots + a_{s-1}x^{s-1} + a_s x^s + a_{s-1}x^{s-1} + \dots + a_0 x^r$ is equal to s and is unique, i.e., $a_0 \leq a_1 \leq \dots \leq a_{s-1} < a_s > a_{s-1} \geq \dots \geq a_0$, where $r = 2s$. The polynomial $q(x)$ is symmetric, unimodal, $\deg q = r-1$, and $q(0) = 0$, that is $q(x) = b_1 x + \dots + b_1 x^{r-1}$ satisfies $b_1 \leq \dots \leq b_{s-1} \leq b_s \geq b_{s-1} \geq \dots \geq b_1$. Then $p(x) + q(x) = a_0 + (a_1 + b_1)x + \dots + (a_{r-1} + b_{r-1})x^{r-1} + a_0 x^r$ is symmetric, unimodal, and $a_{s-1} + b_{s-1} < a_s + b_s$, i.e., its mode is equal to s and it is unique.

Similarly, one can show that the mode of $p(x) + q(x)$ is unique, whenever the mode of $q(x)$ is unique. ■

Lemma 2.8 *If $a > 1$, and $P = 1 + s_1 x + \dots + s_{n-1} x^{n-1} + s_n x^n + s_{n-1} x^{n+1} + \dots + x^{2n}$ is symmetric, unimodal with a unique mode, then $Q = (1 + ax + x^2) \cdot P$ is symmetric and unimodal with a unique mode, equal to $n+1$.*

Proof. The symmetry of Q follows from Theorem 1.3. The coefficients of x^n , x^{n+1} , x^{n+2} in Q are respectively, $t_n = t_{n+2} = s_n + a s_{n-1} + s_{n-2}$ and $t_{n+1} = 2s_{n-1} + a s_n$. Hence we obtain that

$$t_{n+1} - t_n = t_{n+1} - t_{n+2} = (s_{n-1} - s_{n-2}) + (a-1)(s_n - s_{n-1}) > 0,$$

which implies that the mode of Q is equal to $n+1$ and it is unique. ■

Theorem 2.9 *If $H = K_r - e, r \geq 2$, then the polynomial $I(G \circ H; x)$ is unimodal and symmetric for every graph G . Moreover, the mode of $I(G \circ H; x)$ is unique and equal to the order of G .*

Proof. The polynomial $I(G \circ H; x)$ is symmetric, according to Theorem 2.3(ii).

We show, by induction on the order $n = |V(G)|$ of G , that $I(G \circ H; x)$ is unimodal and its mode is unique and equal to n .

If $n = 1$, then $G = K_1$ and $I(G \circ H; x) = I(K_{r+1} - e; x) = 1 + (r+1)x + x^2$, which is clearly unimodal and the mode is unique and equal to n .

If $n = 2$, then either $G = 2K_1$ and

$$\begin{aligned} I(G \circ H; x) &= I(2K_1 \circ H; x) = (1 + (r+1)x + x^2)^2 = \\ &= 1 + (2r+2)x + (r^2 + 2r + 3)x^2 + (2r+2)x^3 + x^4, \end{aligned}$$

or $G = K_2 = (\{v_1, v_2\}, \{v_1v_2\})$ and

$$\begin{aligned} I(G \circ H; x) &= I(K_2 \circ H - v_1; x) + x \cdot I(K_2 \circ H - N[v_1]; x) = \\ &= I(H; x) \cdot I(K_{r+1}; x) + x \cdot I(H; x) = (1 + (r+1)x + x^2) \cdot (1 + (r+2)x + x^2) = \\ &= 1 + (2r+3)x + (r^2 + 3r + 4)x^2 + (2r+3)x^3 + x^4. \end{aligned}$$

In both cases, $I(G \circ H; x)$ is clearly unimodal and the mode is unique and equals n .

Let G be a graph of order $n \geq 3$.

Clearly, if $E = \emptyset$, then $I(G \circ H; x) = (1 + (r+1)x + x^2)^n$, which is unimodal, according to Theorem 1.3, and its mode is unique and equal to n , by Lemma 2.8.

Suppose that $E \neq \emptyset$, and let $v \in V$ be with $N_G(v) = \{u_i : 1 \leq i \leq k\}$.

Applying Theorem 2.3, we obtain

$$I(G \circ H; x) = I(G \circ H - v; x) + x \bullet I(G \circ H - N_{G \circ H}[v]; x) = p(x) + q(x),$$

where

$$p(x) = I(G \circ H - v; x) \text{ and } q(x) = x \bullet I(G \circ H - N_{G \circ H}[v]; x).$$

Claim 1. $p(x)$ is symmetric, unimodal with a unique mode, equal to n .

First, $p(x) = I(H; x) \bullet I((G - v) \circ H; x)$, because $G \circ H - v$ is the disjoint union of H and $(G - v) \circ H$.

The graph $G \circ H$ has a unique maximum independent set, namely the set S containing the non-adjacent vertices from each H . Hence, we get that $\alpha(G \circ H) = \alpha(G \circ H - v) = 2n$, since $S \cap V(G) = \emptyset$, and $v \in V(G)$. According to Theorem 2.3(ii), the polynomial $I((G - v) \circ H; x)$ is symmetric, and by induction hypothesis, $I((G - v) \circ H; x)$ is also unimodal and its mode is unique and equal to $n - 1$. According to Lemma 2.8, $p(x)$ is symmetric and unimodal with a unique mode, equal to n .

Claim 2. $q(x)$ is symmetric and unimodal.

Since $G \circ H - N_{G \circ H}[v]$ consists of the disjoint union of kH and $(G - N_G[v]) \circ H$, we obtain that $q(x) = x \bullet (I(H; x))^k \bullet I((G - N_G[v]) \circ H; x)$.

Further, one can see that $\alpha(G \circ H - N_{G \circ H}[v]) = |S - \{a_1, a_2\}| = \alpha(G \circ H) - 2$, where $\{a_1, a_2\} = S \cap N_{G \circ H}(v)$. The symmetry of $I((G - N_G[v]) \circ H; x)$ follows from

Theorem 2.3(ii). By induction hypothesis, $I((G - N_G[v]) \circ H; x)$ is unimodal with a unique mode. Lemma 2.8 ensures that $(I(H; x))^k \bullet I((G - N_G[v]) \circ H; x)$ is symmetric and unimodal, with a unique mode.

Claim 3. $I(G \circ H; x)$ is symmetric, unimodal and its mode is unique and equals n .

Since $\deg p = \deg q + 1 \geq 2$, and $p(0) = 1$, while $q(0) = 0$, we finally obtain that $I(G \circ H; x) = p(x) + q(x)$ is symmetric and unimodal with a unique mode, according to Lemma 2.7. ■

Since $K_2 - e = 2K_1$, we obtain the following.

Corollary 2.10 [21] *The polynomial $I(G \circ 2K_1; x)$ is unimodal for every graph G .*

3 Conclusions

In this paper we started investigating higher symmetries of polynomials with emphasis on independence polynomials of graphs. This new paradigm already showed its usefulness in revealing a new family of graphs with symmetric independence polynomials. We conclude with the following.

Conjecture 3.1 *$I(G \circ H; x)$ is symmetric for every graph G if and only if $H = K_r - e$ for some $r \geq 2$.*

Problem 3.2 *Describe the set of invariants of a given rational function $\frac{a(x)}{b(x)}$.*

References

- [1] Y. Alavi, P. J. Malde, A. J. Schwenk, P. Erdős, *The vertex independence sequence of a graph is not constrained*, Congressus Numerantium **58** (1987) 15-23.
- [2] G. E. Andrews, *The Theory of Partitions*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, 1976.
- [3] P. Bahls, N. Salazar, *Symmetry and unimodality of independence polynomials of path-like graphs*, The Australasian Journal of Combinatorics **47** (2010) 165-176.
- [4] C. Berge, *Färbung von Graphen deren sämtliche bzw. deren ungerade Kreise starr sind (Zusammenfassung)*, Wiss.Z. Martin-Luther-Univ. Halle **10** (1961) 114-115.
- [5] M. Chudnovsky, N. Robertson, P. D. Seymour and R. Thomas, *Progress on perfect graphs*, Mathematical Programming B **97** (2003) 405-422.
- [6] M. Chudnovsky, N. Robertson, P. D. Seymour and R. Thomas, *The Strong Perfect Graph Theorem*, Annals of Mathematics **164** (2006), 51-229.
- [7] I. Gutman, F. Harary, *Generalizations of the matching polynomial*, Utilitas Mathematica **24** (1983) 97-106.
- [8] I. Gutman, *Independence vertex palindromic graphs*, Graph Theory Notes of New York Academy of Sciences **XXIII** (1992) 21-24.

- [9] I. Gutman, *Independence vertex sets in some compound graphs*, Publications de l'Institut Mathématique **52** (1992) 5-9.
- [10] I. Gutman, *A contribution to the study of palindromic graphs*, Graph Theory Notes of New York Academy of Sciences **XXIV** (1993) 51-56.
- [11] J. W. Kennedy, *Palindromic graphs*, Graph Theory Notes of New York Academy of Sciences **XXII** (1992) 27-32.
- [12] V. E. Levit, E. Mandrescu, *On unimodality of independence polynomials of some well-covered trees*, DMTCS 2003 (C. S. Calude *et al.* eds.), LNCS **2731**, Springer-Verlag (2003) 237-256.
- [13] V. E. Levit, E. Mandrescu, *A family of well-covered graphs with unimodal independence polynomials*, Congressus Numerantium **165** (2003) 195-207.
- [14] V. E. Levit, E. Mandrescu, *Very well-covered graphs with log-concave independence polynomials*, Carpathian Journal of Mathematics **20** (2004) 73-80.
- [15] V. E. Levit, E. Mandrescu, *The independence polynomial of a graph - a survey*, Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Algebraic Informatics, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece, (2005) 233-254. <http://web.auth.gr/cai05/papers/20.pdf>
- [16] V. E. Levit, E. Mandrescu, *Independence polynomials of well-covered graphs: Generic counterexamples for the unimodality conjecture*, European Journal of Combinatorics **27** (2006) 931-939.
- [17] V.E. Levit, E. Mandrescu, *Independence polynomials and the unimodality conjecture for very well-covered, quasi-regularizable, and perfect graphs*, Graph Theory in Paris, Trends Math., Birkhäuser, Basel (2007) 243-254.
- [18] V. E. Levit, E. Mandrescu, *A family of graphs whose independence polynomials are both palindromic and unimodal*, Carpathian Journal of Mathematics **23** (2007) 108-116.
- [19] V. E. Levit, E. Mandrescu, *Graph operations and partial unimodality of independence polynomials*, Congressus Numerantium **190** (2008) 21-31.
- [20] V. E. Levit, E. Mandrescu, *On the independence polynomial of an antiregular graph*, Carpathian Journal of Mathematics **28** (2012) 263-272.
- [21] E. Mandrescu, *Unimodality of some independence polynomials via their palindromicity*, Australasian Journal of Combinatorics **53** (2012) 76-82.
- [22] D. Stevanović, *Graphs with palindromic independence polynomial*, Graph Theory Notes of New York Academy of Sciences **XXXIV** (1998) 31-36.
- [23] Yi Wang, Bao-Xuan Zhu, *On the unimodality of independence polynomials of some graphs*, European Journal of Combinatorics **32** (2011) 10-20.

- [24] Z.F. Zhu, *The unimodality of independence polynomials of some graphs*, Australasian Journal of Combinatorics **38** (2007) 27-33.